

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-18, and 20-26 are in the case. Claims 15-18 and 20-26 have been withdrawn from consideration as non-elected in response to a Restriction Requirement.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of original claim 7, which has been cancelled.

The courtesies extended by Examiner Harlan during a telephone interview on June 5, 2006, are noted with appreciation. During the interview, Examiner Harlan confirmed that claim 1 would be allowable if amended to incorporate the limitations of original claim 8. According to paragraph 5 of the Official Action of January 4, 2006, claims 6-7 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but according to the Office Action Summary and paragraph 4 of the Office action, claims 1-6 and 9-15 were rejected. Therefore it is clear that paragraph 5 should have read "claims 7-8 are objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim."

Therefore claim 8 has been cancelled and the limitation that the resin is prepared in the absence of radiation conditions has been incorporated into claim 1, and so claim 1 should now be allowable.

Reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement is requested. Claims 15-25 depend on Claim 1 and cannot be practiced with a materially different product from that set forth in Claim 1, therefore the Restriction Requirement should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

COZEN O'CONNOR

/s/ Michael B. Fein

By: Michael B. Fein  
Registration 25,333

1900 Market St.  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19103  
215 665-4622 – phone  
215 701-2246 - fax